



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,745	12/09/2004	Ewald Bergler	AT02 0032 US	6073

65913 7590 06/11/2008

NXP, B.V.  
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
M/S41-SJ  
1109 MCKAY DRIVE  
SAN JOSE, CA 95131

EXAMINER
----------

MALEK, LEILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/11/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/517,745	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BERGLER, EWALD	
	<b>Examiner</b> LEILA MALEK	<b>Art Unit</b> 2611	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 October 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/10/2008 has been entered.

### ***Specification***

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

In the abstract Applicant used word "means" several times, this legal phraseology often used in patent claims, should be avoided in the abstract. Therefore, based on MPEP, the abstract needs to be amended.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (background of invention), in view of Kojima et al. (hereafter, referred as Kojima) (US 4,646,327).

As to claims 1 and 5, Applicant in the background of invention discloses a data carrier 1 (see Fig. 1), which is designed to modulate a carrier signal (CS) that can be received in a contactless manner (see page 4), and which is equipped with transmission means (2), designed to transmit the carrier signal, and which is equipped with an electrical circuit (3), which circuit is equipped with at least one terminal (4,5), to which terminal the transmission means (2) is connected and via which terminal (4) the carrier signal can be fed to the circuit (3), and which circuit (3) is equipped with a data signal source (9) designed to generate and emit a data signal (see page 5) having only two voltage values (see page 5, lines 9-13), and which circuit is equipped with modulation means (11) designed to receive the data signal and, using the data signal, to modulate the carrier signal occurring at the at least one terminal, and to generate an amplitude-modulated signal (see page 5, line 21) inherently having only two amplitudes (since the signal is a digital signal, the values are (0,1) or (1,-1)), in which amplitude-modulated signal, signal edges occur (see page 5, line 34). Applicant in the background of

invention discloses all the subject matters claimed in claims 1 and 5, except that the signal-edge influencing means provided in the circuit, which is designed to influence the slope characteristic of the signal edges in the amplitude-modulated signal. Kojima discloses a communication system comprising a waveform shaping apparatus of Fig. 1. Kojima discloses that the data transmitting-receiving device has an input terminal 10 to which digital data from an information source is supplied, a waveform shaping apparatus 11 connected between terminal 10 and D/A converter 12 which supplies its output through a low-pass filter 13 to an amplitude modulator 14 and band-pass filter 15 through which the output of modulator 14, is applied to a transmission line (see column 2, lines 50-60) (since both waveform shaping apparatus 11 and LPF 13, inherently influence the slope characteristic of the signal edges, therefore the combination of 11 and 13 has been interpreted as the signal-edge influencing means). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Applicant's background of invention as taught by Kojima to correct the distortions in the communication system (see column 1, lines 1-18).

As to claims 2 and 6, Kojima further discloses that the signal-edge influencing means 11 and 13 is realized by filtration means (see column 2, lines 50-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Applicant's background of invention as taught by Kojima to correct the distortions in the communication system (see column 1, lines 1-18).

As to claims 3 and 7, Kojima further discloses that the filtration means 11 and 13 is provided between the data signal source (not shown, however it is located before

Art Unit: 2611

waveform shaping apparatus (see column 2, lines 50-60)) and the modulation means 14 and designed to filter the data signal that can be emitted from the data signal source to the modulation means. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Applicant's background of invention as taught by Kojima to correct the distortions in the communication system (see column 1, lines 1-18).

As to claims 4 and 8, Kojima further discloses that the filtration means is formed by a low-pass filter 13 (see column 2, lines 50-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Applicant's background of invention as taught by Kojima to correct the distortions in the communication system (see column 1, lines 1-18).

As to claim 9, Applicant in the background of invention discloses that the circuit (3) is realized as an integrated circuit (see page 4, line 20).

4. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art and Kojima, further in view of Umehara (US 4,118,739).

As to claims 10 and 11, Applicant's admitted prior art and Kojima disclose all the subject matters claimed in claims 5 and 1, except that the modulation means includes a transistor with a control terminal, and the signal-edge influencing means includes a resistor connected to the control terminal of the transistor and a capacitor connected to the control terminal of the transistor and ground. Umehara discloses an apparatus (see Fig. 1 and column 3, last paragraph) comprising a waveform shaper 10 which is an integrating circuit consisting of a capacitor 42 and a resistor 43 and a modulator 13

comprising transistor 25. Umehara further shows that resistor 43 is connected to the control terminal of the transistor 25 and a capacitor 42 is connected to the control terminal of the transistor 25 and ground. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Applicant's background of invention and Kojima as suggested by Umehara to alternately keep the transistor in the cut-off state and the saturation state repeatedly (see column 3, last paragraph).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leila Malek whose telephone number is 571-272-8731. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on 571-272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 2611

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Leila Malek  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2611

/L.M./  
/Leila Malek/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2611

/Mohammad H Ghayour/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2611